



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,972	12/30/2005	Jean-Claude Sarfati	11345/119001	6274
22511	7590	09/11/2007	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P.			NGUYEN, PHILLIP H	
1221 MCKINNEY STREET			ART UNIT	
SUITE 2800			PAPER NUMBER	
HOUSTON, TX 77010			2191	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/529,972	SARFATI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phillip H. Nguyen	2191	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Phillip H. Nguyen. (3) Seema M. Mehta (Reg. No. 56,235).
 (2) SPE (WEI ZHEN). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Parkkinen.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed the differences between prior art and the invention. Applicant's representative may amend the claims to overcome the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



WEI ZHEN
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required



OSHA • LIANG LLP

www.oshaliang.com

Houston - Silicon Valley - Paris

One Houston Center • Suite 2800
1221 McKinney Street
Houston, Texas 77010
Tel: 713.228.8600
Fax: 713.228.8778

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

DATE: 8/13/07

FILE NUMBER: 11345/119001

TO: Examiner P. Nguyen

FAX NUMBER: 571-270-2070

FROM: Seema M. Mehta, Reg No. 56,235

PAGES INCLUDING COVER: 2

RE: Agenda for Examiner Interview set up for August 22, 2007, at 2PM EST. Application
Serial No. 10/529,972

☐ URGENT ☒ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY ☐ PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This document (including any attachments) may contain privileged or confidential information. In the event that this document has been sent to you in error, or otherwise has been misdirected, please call the sender COLLECT at 713.228.8600 to arrange for its prompt return or destruction. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Examiner interview Agenda

Application Serial No. 10/529,972

Participants: Seema M. Mehta, Reg. No. 56,235
Examiner P. Nguyen

During the Examiner Interview, Applicants would like to discuss the following:

1. The overall inventive concept of the present invention, including the points of novelty the Applicants would like to make sure that the Examiner understands;
2. The 112 rejection of claims 1-15 and how best to clarify that the downloaded software authenticates the first integrated software using a second certificate;
3. The 103 rejection of the claims in view of Parkkinen – Applicants believe that Parkkinen simply does not teach or suggest a mutual authentication as is claimed in the present invention, where a first software authenticates a second software, and then in turn, the second software authenticates the first, while the second software is executing.
4. The Examiner's assertions that such mutual authentication would be obvious to those skilled in the art.